

REMARKS

In this response, claims 1, 2, 13, 15, 17, 18, and 20 have been amended, claims 4, 5, and 16 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new claims 25-30 have been added. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Obviousness Rejections of Claims 1-8, 10, 13, and 15-24

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-8, 10, and 18-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Maeda (U.S. Patent No. 5,606,630), Mita (U.S. Patent No. 5,231,677), and Fujii (U.S. Patent No. 2002/0114015). At page 11 of the Office Action, claims 13 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Maeda, Mita, Fujii, and Hsieh (U.S. Patent No. 6,011,558). At page 13 of the Office Action, claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Maeda, Mita, Fujii, Hsieh, and Sobel (U.S. Patent No. 6,707,937). These rejections are respectfully traversed with amendment.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite the features of “determining a first weighted edge layer comprising a weighted value for each pixel of the first edge layer, *each weighted value comprising: a first set of bits representative of a number of Boolean pixel edge indicators within one pixel of the corresponding pixel of the first edge layer; and a second set of bits representative of a number of Boolean pixel edge indicators within two pixels of the corresponding pixel of the first edge layer*” and “blending the first video layer with a first other layer based upon only one of a vertical edge component or a horizontal edge component of the first edge layer and *based upon the weighted values of the first weighted edge layer*, the first other layer comprising a smoothed representation of the first video layer” Independent claims 18 and 20 have been similarly amended. Support for these amendments can be found at FIG. 4 and paragraphs 0027, 0028, and 0032-0038 of the Present Application. No new matter is introduced by these amendments.

None of the cited references disclose or otherwise contemplate the determination of the claimed weighted edge layer comprising the claimed weighted values, much less the particular claimed arrangement of the first set of bits representative of a number of Boolean pixel edge indicators within one pixel of the corresponding pixel of the first edge layer and a second set of bits representative of a number of Boolean pixel edge indicators within two pixels of the corresponding pixel of the first edge layer. The cited references also likewise fail to disclose or otherwise contemplate blending a video layer based upon a weighted edge layer having such weighted values. Moreover, these additional claim features are not obvious in view of the cited references, individually or in combination. Accordingly, the proposed combinations of Maeda, Mita, Fujii, Hsieh, and Sobel fail to disclose or render obvious the particular combinations of features recited by claims 1, 18, and 20, as well as the particular combinations of features recited by pending claims 2, 3, 6-8, 10, 13, 15, 17, 19, and 21-24 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from one of claims 1, 18, or 20. Moreover, these dependent claims recite additional novel and non-obvious features.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections is respectfully requested.

Addition of New Claims 25-30

New claims 25-30, which respectively depend from one of claims 1, 18, and 20, have been added. Support for these new claims is found at FIG. 4 and paragraphs 0027 and 0028 of the Present Application. No new matter is introduced by these amendments.

New claim 28 recites the additional features of “wherein the weighted value comprises an eight-bit byte, the first set of bits comprises the lower four bits of the byte, and the second set of bits comprises the upper four bits of the byte.” New claims 29 and 30 recite similar features. As discussed above, none of the cited references disclose or render obvious a weighted value comprising a first set of bits representative of a number of Boolean pixel edge indicators within one pixel of the corresponding pixel of the edge layer and a second set of bits representative of a number of Boolean pixel edge indicators within two pixels of the corresponding pixel of the edge layer. The cited references therefore necessarily fail to disclose or render obvious, individually or in combination, the additional features of wherein the first set of bits comprises the lower four

bits of a byte and the second set of bits comprises the upper four bits of the byte as provided by claims 28-30. New claims 25-27 likewise recite additional novel and non-obvious features. Claims 25-30 therefore are allowable over the cited references.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-1835.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ryan S. Davidson/
Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL & POLANSKY, LLP
5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone)
(512) 439-7199 (fax)

March 9, 2009
Date